

#### **ATTENDING AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS**

1. Mead & Hunt
2. HDR
3. Sacramento County Office of Education
4. Peterson Brustad, Inc.
5. Yuba County
6. Rural County Representatives of California
7. The Nature Conservancy
8. CMI
9. Delta Stewardship Council
10. California State Association of Counties
11. Parsons Brinckerhoff
12. City of Woodland
13. San Joaquin County
14. Sacramento County
15. Office of Congresswoman Doris Matsui
16. Department of Water Resources
17. Association of Bay Area Governments
18. Tetra Tech

#### **SUMMARY**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) invited area agency and stakeholder contacts to attend a briefing that highlighted the findings of the public review draft of *California’s Flood Future: Recommendations for Managing the State’s Flood Risk*. The team again worked with Sacramento County and CSAC to distribute the meeting information and arrange logistics.

DWR’s Terri Wegener and USACE’s Kim Carsell lead the approximately 50-minute Sacramento presentation. A deeper discussion of each *California’s Flood Future* recommendation followed.

#### **Key meeting questions/suggestions Included:**

- Discussion regarding how information from the Delta Stewardship Council or about the Delta was incorporated into the report
- Discussion related to how the recommendations will be implemented – as different agencies have varying jurisdictions and responsibilities
- The scope of regional flood assessments could potentially be incorporated into regional plans through CVFPP with additional funding
- Flood insurance companies might be interested in participating in next phases or discussions
- Integrate discussion of flood risk with insurance to educate public and policy makers
- HMPs could be expanded and used as a forum/opportunity to discuss flood risk with policy makers
- Policy makers need understand link between land use decisions (i.e., development in flood plains) and public liabilities in terms of life and economic terms
- The plan should continue to discuss environmental benefits of flooding

- Incentivizing better practices is challenging – need balance between development (economics) and public safety
- Funding for projects should not wait until everyone is ready – let those that have completed work, have resources, and implemented IRWM process move ahead
- Funding for flood risk comes when public sees clear risk, experiences damage, or their house or income are affected – Discussions must make problem real and provide understandable economic or financial risks data

## RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSION

(Italics indicate ideas or phrases from meeting presenters)

### Recommendation 1

#### Conduct regional flood risk assessments to better understand statewide flood risk.

- Who's going to conduct these assessments? You have situations where there are FMAs where this is done, other parts of state has little resources, various jurisdictions – hard to compile that information on a large scale.
  - *DWR is funding regional plans through the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan*
- Have you had any discussion on whether you can give those groups more money to accomplish these kinds of regional assessments?
  - *Right now, the scopes of those plans is very limited.*

### Recommendation 2

#### Increase public and policymaker awareness about flood risks to facilitate informed decisions.

- There's an opportunity to get into educational system through what we're asking K12 students to know – to take topical, current California issues and use these maps for math, geography, etc.
- Tailoring messages to specific audiences, like elected officials, is key. Consider developing a policy brief, which is helpful to policymakers, or presentation templates that can be made by city/county level information.
- Part of our environment is living with risk – complicated problem to explain and convey.
- Do private insurance companies come into play at all in this discussion? If they lower risk, they are incentivized to sell insurance. Integrating that information into the public discussion – not just at private level – could be helpful. Maybe there's an opportunity for integration of insurance into flood risk/protection discussions.
- Is it possible for the state to help with an insurance model – they have earthquake authority that provides protection over insurance (earthquake liability act) – is it possible to create a similar system for flood insurance where they offer protection, but state provides extended coverage. Maybe FEMA would allow state to do it as pilot, so each state can establish programs based on their risk. Private industry and better gauge costs and risks for specific areas.

### Recommendation 3

**Increase support for flood emergency preparedness, response, and recovery programs to reduce flood impacts.**

- Cal EMA has state hazard plan that includes flooding – but I think they have executive orders that defer to DWR. Good to know what Cal EMA standards are to incorporate throughout the state.
- Prop 1E money was issued – money to emergency response programs – but it didn't flow to locals. SB 27 – Delta emergency response plan has been adopted – has that been incorporated?
  - *Each county and city might have plan, but they haven't communicated up.*

**Recommendation 4**

**Encourage land use planning practices that reduce the consequences of flooding.**

- You can talk about benefits of flooding – like groundwater recharge, ecosystem – but they are often lost.
- Related to education and consequences of structural issues – getting people up to speed on liability questions on development in a floodplain – likely county flood board - how do they deal with development decisions and flood?
- Sustainable community strategies in other areas– land use planning taking place without risk thoughts – general guidelines would be helpful.
- Interesting on statewide level to incorporate general planning process for counties that is more thought through.
- In some areas, everything is flat and there is nowhere to go. How are you incorporating AB 32 – and other state requirements the state is putting on counties and cities. Worrying about “incentivizing best practices” is difficult because it's hard to improve the system, when you are saying improving the current system without opening floodgates for development (can't avoid building there all together)

**Recommendation 5**

**Implement flood management from regional, systemwide, and statewide perspectives to provide multiple benefits.**

- Have you thought about only letting state funds go toward IWM projects?
- Regional prioritization sounds great, but is there a peer review? While it's great for people to say they have these, is there some way to prove justifications?
  - *IRWM – determines how you want to organize – develop criteria on how to grade projects, and then set out proposals – so keep people from fighting over projects and leverage projects together.*

**Recommendation 6**

**Increase collaboration among public agencies to improve flood management planning, policies and investments.**

*(Due to presentation technical difficulties, notes aren't available for this recommendation.)*

**Recommendation 7**

**Establish sufficient and stable funding mechanisms to reduce flood risk.**

*(Due to presentation technical difficulties, notes aren't available for this recommendation.)*

###